

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/803,894**
Response filed March 28, 2007
Reply to OA dated January 3, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are presented for examination. Claim 1 has been amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to which Applicants regard as their invention. Support for amended claim 1 can be found on p.27, lines 6-7, of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **January 3, 2007**.

Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action indicated that claims 1-12 and 14-20 would be allowable provided that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the limitation “throughput of the dispersion.”

For example, the Office Action asked whether “throughput” is (1) the amount of the dispersion that exits the agitating apparatus after the specified steps; (2) the amount of dispersion that is mixed in the mixing step; (3) the quantity of dispersion in the dispersion tank; or, (4) the amount of dispersion that is fed back into the dispersion supply tank. Claim 1 has been amended to define the term “throughput” as being the amount of dispersion that is fed back into the dispersion supply tank. Support for this

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/803,894**
Response filed March 28, 2007
Reply to OA dated January 3, 2007

claim amendment can be found at p. 27, lines 6-7, of the specification which describes the claim term as “the throughput of the dispersion in the dispersing machine.”

Additionally, in the Remarks section of the Amendment filed on October 30, 2006, Applicants explained that the term “throughput” means an output of fine droplets resulting from an agitation step provided for processing during the polymerizing step.

In accordance with the Office Action’s comments, claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim “throughput” as being “the amount of dispersion that is fed back into the dispersion supply tank.”

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-12 and 14-20, as amended, are in condition for allowance and, therefore, request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/803,894**
Response filed March 28, 2007
Reply to OA dated January 3, 2007

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
/James E. Armstrong, III/
James E. Armstrong, III
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 18,366

JEA/sks

Atty. Docket No. **040136**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

(202) 659-2930